

<b>Notice of Allowability</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/614,141	BERGMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael B. Holmes	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1.  This communication is responsive to November 22, 2004.
2.  The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-18.
3.  The drawings filed on 22 November 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.
4.  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a)  All
  - b)  Some\*
  - c)  None
 of the:
  1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  
**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5.  A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
6.  CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
  - (a)  including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached
    - 1)  hereto or 2)  to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b)  including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
7.  DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

#### Attachment(s)

1.  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2.  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948)
3.  Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),  
Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit  
of Biological Material
5.  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6.  Interview Summary (PTO-413),  
Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
7.  Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8.  Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9.  Other \_\_\_\_\_.



---

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**Examiner's Detailed Office Action**

1. Claims 1-18 are allowed.

**REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

2. The following is an Examiner's statement for reasons for allowance:
3. The closest prior art *Chakrabarti et al.* (USPN 6,389,436), *Straforini et al.* (USPN 6,092,059), and *Powers et al.* (USPN 6,513,027) do not teach or render obvious applicant's claimed invention. In particular, as pointed out below, the prior art lacks certain features and the combination as specified in the respective claims.
4. With regards to claim 1 *Chakrabarti et al.*, *Straforini et al.*, and *Powers et al.* do not disclose ... using the classifier associated with the first set, trained on examples from the first set, to classify the second set thereby generating classification results for the second set of labels, and using the classifier associated with the second set, trained on examples from the second set, to classify the first set thereby generating classification results for the first set of labels; and generating label association rules based on the classification results for the first set of labels and the classification results for the second set of labels.

5. With regards to claim 9 *Chakrabarti et al.*, *Straforini et al.*, and *Powers et al.* do not disclose ... using the classifier associated with the first set, trained on examples from the first set, to classify the second set thereby generating classification results for the second set of labels, and use the classifier associated with the second set, trained on examples from the second set, to classify the first set thereby generating classification results for the first set of labels; and generating label association rules based on the classification results for the first set of labels and the classification results for the second set of labels.

6. With regards to claim 17 *Chakrabarti et al.*, *Straforini et al.*, and *Powers et al.* do not disclose ... using the classifier associated with the first set, trained on examples from the first set, to classify the second set thereby generating classification results for the second set of labels, and using the classifier associated with the second set, trained on examples from the second set, to classify the first set thereby generating classification results for the first set of labels; and generating label association rules based on the classification results for the first set of labels and the classification results for the second set of labels.

7. With regards to claim 18 *Chakrabarti et al.*, *Straforini et al.*, and *Powers et al.* do not disclose ... using the classifier associated with the first set, trained on examples from the first set, to classify the second set thereby generating classification results for the second set of labels, and using the classifier associated with the second set, trained on examples from the second set, to classify the first set thereby generating classification results for the first set of labels; and generating label association rules based on the classification results for the first set of labels and the classification results for the second set of labels.

## Correspondence Information

8. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email [Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov](mailto:Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov).

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

***Michael B. Holmes***  
Patent Examiner  
Artificial Intelligence  
Art Unit 2121  
United States Department of Commerce  
Patent & Trademark Office

Thursday, March 10, 2005

MBH



Anthony Knight  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600